

Letter from Hon. J. K. Paulding.

[The following letter from Hon. J. K. Paulding, former Secretary of the Navy, is worthy of attention, not only for the sound views it contains, but also on account of the latitude from which it comes.]

HYDE PARK, Duches Co., N. Y., September 6, 1851.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter directed to me at New York, conveying an invitation to address a meeting of the citizens of Charleston district, to be held in Charleston, South Carolina, on the 17th inst., has just reached me at this place, where I now reside.

For the compliment thus tendered, and the language in which it is conveyed, I beg you to accept my acknowledgments, accompanied by regrets that I cannot comply with your wishes. Distance and space, the burden of years I should bear with me, and more than all, my incapacity for public speaking, compel me to decline a task for which I am totally unfitted. What I have to say, I therefore hope you will permit me to address to you, through a medium to which I am more accustomed.

As it appears from the tenor of your letter that you are already sufficiently aware of the opinion I entertain with regard to what is whimsically called the Compromise, I will only trouble you with a brief recapitulation. In my view, it was a gross and palpable violation of that great fundamental principle of State equality, which pervades every provision of the Constitution, and forms the basis of this Confederation; a most unjustifiable attack on the rights, interests, safety and happiness of one half the States composing it, accompanied by insult and obloquy; a pretended concession, wrested by mere force of numbers from a minority; and that, in its consequences, it will prove more fatal to the repose, prosperity and happiness, if not the very existence, of the Union, than any measure that may be resorted to in attempting to obtain redress for the past, or security for the future.

Such being my views of the subject, I am, and always have been, of opinion, that the stand originally taken by South Carolina, and most of the Southern States, in opposition to the principles embodied in that series of measures, was not only justifiable, but demanded by a proper regard for their rights and their honor; and that an abandonment of the position they then assumed, and an acquiescence in measures they repeatedly declared they would resist, "at all hazards and to the last extremity," unless accompanied by a frank acknowledgment of having been wrong in the first instance, would, in the language of the printed resolutions appended to your letter, be "what they could not submit to without dishonor." If such an abandonment of all previous pledges and declarations were the result of a subsequent conviction of having greatly erred in making them, it would be honorable and magnanimous. But such appears not to be the case; since even the advocates of acquiescence still continue to assert the principles on which these pledges and declarations were based, as well as the wrongs which first called them forth.

The Association is, I believe, right in its second resolution—declaring its belief that the co-operation of any of the Southern States with South Carolina, either in resistance or secession, is at least improbable, so long as the influence and patronage of the General Government are arrayed against State rights. Nor do I see any reason for believing, that any probable change of administration will produce a change of measures; since, as you will perceive, from their repeated declarations, all parties in the North unite in denouncing slavery, and maintaining the Constitutional right of Congress, as well as its inflexible duty, to prohibit its extension to any State that may hereafter be admitted into the Union. From all present appearances, the principles embodied in the Compromise will continue to be the basis of the future policy of the Government. It seems also probable, that the States which have submitted to past, will be equally quiescent under future wrongs.

Having thus briefly stated my views with regard to your first and second, I will now revert to your last and most important resolution, namely, "that falling in a reasonable time to obtain the co-operation of other Southern States, South Carolina should alone withdraw from the Union."

It seems rather late in the day to be called on to combat the old exploded doctrine of passive obedience, and non-resistance, the assertion of which cost one monarch his head, and sent another into perpetual exile. Yet, as that doctrine has lately been revived by some of the highest names of the Republic, it calls for a passing notice in connection with the subject of this letter. It seems strange, too, that this long-buried monster, which received its death wounds in the two revolutions of England and America, should have been dug up and resuscitated by distinguished Democratic Republican statesmen. From all but the darkest regions of the civilized world, this portentous phantom has been banished, as it would appear, only to find refuge in that which

professes to be the most free and enlightened. There is not a European writer, or statesman, or theologian, of any established reputation, that would now venture to proclaim the slavish principles which have been asserted by Republican leaders in the Halls of Congress of Republican States.

A thorough discussion of this doctrine of passive obedience, and non-resistance on the part of equal members of a Confederation of States, would require more space than is proper for me to occupy, and more time than you can spare on this occasion; nor do I deem it necessary. The right of resistance by force, as respects States and communities, is only an extension of the individual right of self-defence, which is a law of nature, antecedent and paramount to all laws and all constitutions, which cannot be alienated or surrendered by the adoption of any system of social organization. This doctrine is established beyond controversy, by the unanswerable and unanswerable arguments of Sydney and Locke; by the assent of all the great ancient as well as modern authorities on the law of nature and nations; and, if such were not the case, it has always been, and always will be, acted upon when the occasion arises, in opposition to all authorities. It is true that none of the writers who assert or concede the right of resistance, have attempted to define the precise line where resistance becomes justifiable, because it is not susceptible of definition. It is a matter of feeling, and can neither be analyzed or defined.

An eminent American statesman, high in office, and a candidate for still higher honors, whose opinions I wish to treat with all due respect, has lately attempted to establish a broad distinction between revolution and secession; in other words, the right to resist, and the right of retiring out of the reach of the necessity of resorting to resistance. His position, if I rightly comprehend him, is, that though a people or State may have a right to resist by force in certain contingencies, they have none to retire peaceably beyond the reach of injury and oppression. It seems they have no alternative; they must either peaceably submit, or forcibly resist, for they cannot get out of the way. It follows that all radical changes in the political relations of a State with a Confederation of States, must necessarily be brought about by violence and bloody contentions. Those who cannot live together in peace, must not part in peace; they must resort to the right of the strongest, and fight it out.

Thus the extermination of a portion of our fellow-creatures, perhaps our countrymen, is an indispensable preliminary to all great political changes; and hence, toms must be offered up on the altar of liberty, before she can become a legitimate goddess. The establishment of this principle, conceding the right of revolution, and denying that of secession, would, in its application to the case now under consideration, leave no resource to any member of this confederation, under the most intolerable oppression, but civil war, with all its aggravations. It leaves open no appeal to the great tribunal of reason, justice and humanity; the right of the strongest is the right divine; and dissensions among a confederation of Christian States, can only be adjusted, like those of the wild beasts of the forest, by a death struggle. I am aware that this has been the almost invariable practice of mankind in every age and country; but never till now do I recollect seeing it asserted that it was the only justifiable mode of settling controversies among States and nations; and it is with no little regret I see this doctrine sanctioned by one whose opinions are of such high authority among a large portion of the American people. I have dwelt more emphatically on this topic, because I consider the right of secession as by far the most important of all the questions involved in the present controversy; and the attack on it as one of the most insidious, as well as dangerous blows, ever levelled at the rights of the State, all of whom are deeply interested in the issue; since those who are now the aggressors, may one day be placed in a position where it will be their only refuge from the uncontrolled despotism of a majority.

With regard to the expediency of the State of South Carolina exercising this right of secession, either now or at any future period, it would, I conceive, be presumptuous in one so far removed from the scene of action to offer his opinion, or intrude his advice. In such a crisis, South Carolina must act for herself, and rely on herself alone. I would only observe, that in taking a step so decisive as that of withdrawing from the Union, unanimity among her citizens, or something nearly approaching it, seems indispensable. It appears, however, that many distinguished men among you, whose reputation is national, whose opinions are entitled to great weight, and who have heretofore taken the lead in opposing the Compromise, believe that the time for secession is not yet come; that the co-operation of at least a majority of the Southern States is absolutely necessary to the successful issue of such a measure; that it is best to wait for further injuries, or at least to see whether they will be attempted, and if so, whether they will produce such co-operation. Those whose views coincide with the resolutions adop-

ted by your Association, on the other hand, believe that immediate secession, or secession after "waiting a reasonable time" for the co-operation of other States, is indispensable to the safety and honor of the State of South Carolina. Which of these parties will eventually predominate remains to be seen; and until that is decided, I shall content myself with asserting the right of secession, leaving the expediency of its exercise to be decided by the result. Should it be found that a very considerable minority is not only opposed, but will resist a resort to this remedy for their grievances, I conceive its immediate adoption would be hazardous in the extreme. But when great interests are at stake, much should be risked in their preservation. For myself, I will only say, that were I a citizen of South Carolina, or any other Southern State, I trust I should not be found among those, who, after placing themselves in front of the battle, and leading their followers into a position where they could not retreat without dishonor, retired from the field, only, it would seem, to see if the enemy would pursue them.

A few words more, Gentlemen, in order that I may not be misunderstood or misrepresented, and I will no longer trespass on your time or patience. If I know myself, and the innermost feelings of my heart, I am a better friend to the Union than many of those who, while loudly professing their devotion, are steadily pursuing a course of policy that has already alienated a considerable portion of its citizens, and will assuredly bring about its dissolution. It is under the influence of this attachment, that I have lent my feeble aid in opposition to that policy. Neither force nor coercion can preserve a Union voluntarily formed on the basis of perfect equality; nor do I believe it possible to preserve or perpetuate this Confederation by any attempts to extend the powers of the General Government beyond the limits prescribed by the Constitution, strictly construed, agreeably to its letter and spirit. The first attempt to coerce any one of its members will be the handwriting on the wall, predicting the speedy and certain fate of the Union. It is not to be presumed that great States, many of them equal in extent to powerful kingdoms, and inhabited by increasing millions of freemen, jealous of their rights, brave, high-spirited, and energetic, can be held together except by a voluntary cohesion. This Confederation may be likened to the great system of the universe, and it is, only, by the benign and gentle influence of attraction, that the bright stars of our constellation can be kept in their orbits. Those who attempt to divide or separate them, will in the end, fire like the rash fool who aspired to direct the chariot of the sun.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient serv't,
J. K. PAULDING.
To F. D. Richardson, H. H. Raymond, W. H. Peronneau—Committee, &c., &c., Charleston, South Carolina.

Letter from Hon. Herschel V. Johnson.

[This admirable letter was written by Gov. Johnson, upon the occasion of the wrong which was done to the South, upon the admission of California into the Union, under so many circumstances of irregularity, and of disregard to the interests of the South; a wrong, which is dwarfed into absolute insignificance, when compared with those fearful calamities, which are rapidly approaching in the election of a Black Republican administration, and which will overwhelm the South, when that hostile party shall take possession of the government, and consummate their openly avowed purpose of emancipating the slaves.

The letter, throughout, breathes the true spirit of a manly Southern heart, sensitive to the wrongs of his country, and determined not to submit to them. If sentiments like these, were resolutely carried out into manly action, the South would no longer be aggressed upon; nor would her just remaining refuge, against oppression and insult, be denied her—of withdrawing herself from the control of her avowed enemies and oppressors. She has been, heretofore, insulted and trampled upon, and she is now doomed by the Black Republican party, to degradation and ruin, simply because she is considered too slothful and cowardly to defend her rights, or adopt any efficient measures, to beat back the aggressor, and establish her safety, upon the sure foundation of a friendly government of her own.]

"MILLEDGEVILLE, Ga., Aug. 30, 1851.
Gentlemen: I thank you for your kind and pressing invitation to a barbecue, to be given to Col. Robert McMillen, the Southern Rights candidate for Congress in the 8th district, on the first Tuesday in September next; but official engagements forbid me the pleasure of its acceptance. Morgan court will be in session at the same time.
My personal acquaintance with Col. McMillen is limited, but I know him by reputation as a gentleman of high moral worth, brilliant talents, and sound republican principles. Such men I am pleased to honor, and sincerely trust the great cause whose banner he bears by the united voice of the Southern Rights party of his district, may be triumphant.
The contest in which the people of Georgia, in common with her sister slave-

holding States, are engaged, is one of vital importance. It involves the destiny of the South, and the federative character of our system of government. It is waged upon the right of a State peaceably to secede from the Union. The gubernatorial candidate of the Southern States Rights party maintains the affirmative, and the candidate of the submission party the negative of this great question—the one, that the right necessarily results from the reserved sovereignty of the State and the nature of the Confederacy; and the other, that it exists only as a right of revolution.

The former insists that the General Government has no right to coerce a seceding State; and the latter that such a seceding State must depend for the maintenance of its position, "upon the stout hearts and strong arms of a free people." The one unhesitatingly and boldly avows that if a Southern State were to secede, he would not obey a requisition by the federal government made upon him as the Executive of Georgia for troops to force her back into the Union; and the other declares he "would convene the Legislature of the State, and command them to call a convention of the people," to instruct him in an emergency in which the impulses of a true Southern heart should be a sufficient guide.

The great issue, then, I repeat, is the right of a State to secede from the Union, and the correlative absence of any right on the part of the federal government to force such a State back into the Union. It cannot be evaded by the senseless clamor of Union! this glorious Union! The integrity of the Union is not assailed by the Southern Rights party in Georgia. Its true friends are those who insist upon maintaining the rights resulting from the sovereignty of the States. Its real enemies are those who, from behind it, as a "masked battery," level their destructive artillery against its strongest outposts, by counselling submission to aggression, injustice and robbery, because, like "a wolf in sheep's clothing," they come under the hypocritical guise of compromise. Then let a vigilant people look well to the true and only issue involved in the pending campaign—the right of a State peaceably to secede from the Union.

I would not, if time and space justified, enter into an argument in favor of the affirmative of this issue. I believe it is understood by the people. It has been a cardinal tenet of the Republican creed from 1798 down to the present day, maintained by Jefferson, and Madison, and Macon, Lowndes and Troup, and all the distinguished statesmen of that school, who properly understood the theory of our government, and whose hearts beat responsively to the great American sentiment which is at once the parent and the soul of constitutional liberty. Argument is not needed to elucidate and enforce it. If the people, shaking off the trammels of party, and spurning the timid counsels of temporizing submissionists and selfish tradesmen in the great mart of political bartering, will obey the honest impulses of true Southern sentiment, they will require no argument to array them on the side of truth, their hearth-stones, and the Constitution.

To detract from the importance of the issue in public estimation, it is insisted that it is a mere abstraction—that it will be time enough for Georgia to determine it when she shall be called upon to exercise the right of secession. This is but one of the hundred subtleties of those who man the "masked battery." The issue is vital. It has not been made by the State of Georgia, nor by the Southern States. It has been forced upon us by federal aggressions. It has been distinctly tendered by high authority. It was tendered by Henry Clay in his great speech upon "the compromise bills."

He said "if resistance is attempted by any State, or by the people of any State, he will lift his voice, his heart and his arm in the support of the common authority of this government." Through Mr. Webster, the Secretary of State, it has been tendered by the rotten dynasty of the Fillmore Administration; for he has distinctly proclaimed the policy of the Cabinet to be coercion, if any State should attempt secession. The issue, then, is upon us. Shall we meet it? Shall we ingloriously shrink from its decision? It is true, that to past aggressions Georgia has determined to offer no resistance. But the right to resist, and to resist peaceably, without the terror of federal bayonets, she cannot yield; and now she is called upon to make the decision. Let her meet it with firmness and unanimity.

Whoever observes the signs of the times cannot fail to see that the right of secession will probably, at no distant day, assume the form and magnitude of practical importance. The South is in a permanent minority in our Federal Legislature. The tone of Northern fanaticism abates not in its frenzy and insolence. It presses on rapidly to the consummation of its diabolical designs.
And what check has the South upon its progress? Have we any under the established rules of parliamentary law? Can we expect any justice at the hands of the present feeble Executive and his Cabinet? Can we effect anything by argument, and appeals to the reason of our Northern oppressors? Can we obtain shelter under the broad shield of the Constitution? No! All these are impotent as pack-thread to

restrain an irrisponsible and fanatical majority. What, then, are we to do? I say, let us bear to the last point of endurance, but let us never proclaim, through the ballot box, that we have no right to secede, and that if we do secede we are to be regarded as insurgents and revolutionists. It never, never can be true, that our forefathers, in the struggle of '76, fought only to achieve that which is the right of seifs, the right of revolution. They had that under the British crown. But they struggled for more—for colonial sovereignty—and they won it.

Did they turn around immediately and surrender all they had battled for into the power of an elective consolidation? Never, never. Those who maintain such positions, falsify all the history of our revolution, and bring dishonor upon the master spirits of its thrilling and eventful scenes. The right of secession must be maintained. It is the last, the only hope of the South. Let us maintain it with unanimity, and we can hold in check the spirit of abolition and consolidation. But if we yield it, the whole theory of our federative system is changed, and we are in the power of those whose mercy is like that of the wolf to the lamb. If we yield it, we not only proclaim in advance, that we still submit to usurpation and aggression, but we do worse, we admit that we have no right to resist. And that is political vassalage.

With sentiments of high regard,
I am, gentlemen, your obt serv't,
HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON.
To Messrs. Robt. A. White, Turner Clanto, T. W. Fleming, Committee.

THE SEA.—The mean depth of the sea, according to La Place, from three to five miles. If the existing waters were increased by one-fourth, it would drown the earth, with the exception of some high mountains. If the volume of the ocean were augmented by only one eighth, considerable portions of the continents would be changed all over the globe. Evaporation would be so much extended, that rains would continually destroy the harvest, and fruits and flowers, and subvert the whole economy of nature. There is, perhaps, nothing more beautiful in our whole system than the process by which our fields are irrigated from the skies, the rivers fed from the mountains, and the ocean restrained within bounds, which it never can exceed so long as that process continues on the present scale. The vapor raised by the sun from the sea floats where ever it is lighter than the atmosphere; condensed, it falls upon the earth in water; or attracted to the mountains, dissolves, and replenishes the conduits with which, externally or internally, they are all furnished. By these conduits the fluid is conveyed to the rivers which flow on that surface of the earth, and to the springs which lie deep in its bosom, destined to be considerably diminished, the Amazon and the Mississippi, those inland seas of the western world, would become considerable brooks; the brooks would wholly disappear; the atmosphere would be deprived of its due proportion of humidity; all nature would assume the garb of desolation; the birds would drop on the wing, the lower animals would perish on the barren soil, and man himself would wither away like the sickly grass at his feet.

GOLDEN RULES FOR WIVES.—Resolve every morning to be cheerful that day; and should anything occur to break your resolution, suffer it not to put you out of temper with your husband. Dispute not with him, be the subject what it may; but rather deny yourself the satisfaction of having your own will, or gaining the better of argument, than risk a quarrel or create a heart burning which it is impossible to see the end of. Implicit submission of a man to his wife is ever disgraceful to both, but implicit submission in a wife to the just will of her husband, is what she promises at the altar, what the good will rever her for, and what is, in fact, the greatest honor she can receive. Be assured, a woman's power, as well as her happiness, has no other foundation than her husband's esteem and love, which it is her interest, by all possible means, to preserve and increase; share and soothe his cares, and with the utmost assiduity, conceal his errors.

FASHIONABLE CALL.—Enter Miss Lucy nearly out of breath, with the exertion of walking from her papa's carriage in the street, to the door of her friend.

Lucy.—"Oh, Marie! how do you do? How delighted I am to see you! How have you been since you were at the ball, last Thursday evening? Oh, wasn't the appearance of that tall girl in pink, perfectly frightful? Is this your shawl on the piano? Beautiful shawl! Father says he is going to send to Paris to get me a shawl, in the spring. I can't bear homemade shawls! How do you like Monsieur Esprey? Beautiful man, ain't he? No, don't laugh, Marie, for I don't care anything about him! Oh, my! I must be going! It's a beautiful day, isn't it? Marie, when are you coming up to see me? Oh, dear what a beautiful pin! That pin was given to you; now I know it was, Marie; don't deny it. Harry is coming up to see me this evening, but I hate him—I do, really; but he has a beautiful moustache, hasn't he, Marie? Oh, dear, it's very warm. Good morning, Marie! Don't speak of Harry in connection with my name, to any one; for I am sure it will never amount to anything, but I hate him awfully—I am sure I do. Adieu!"

CURIOS WILL.—One of our correspondents, who has a taste for such matters, has collected and sent us for publication in the Ledger, the following curious extracts from still more curious wills. The first is from the will of George Applebee, Rector of St. Bride's, London, proved August 7, 1783.

"My body, after being dressed in a flannel waistcoat, instead of a shirt, an old surtout coat, and breeches without flaps or pockets; an old pair of stockings, shoes I shall want none (having done walking), and a worsted wig, if one can be got. I desire may be decently interred."

The second is from the will of Stephen Swaine, of St. Olive's, Southwark, proved February 5, 1770.

"I give and bequeath unto John Aldon, and Mary, his wife, the sum of six pounds apiece, to buy each of them a halfpenny of the Sheriff's should not be provided."

The third is from the will of William Shackell, Esq., Governor of Plymouth, proved October 12, 1782.

"I desire that my body may be kept as long as it may not be offensive, and that one of my toes or fingers may be cut off to secure a certainty of my being dead. I also make this further request to my dear wife, that as she has been troubled with one old fool, she will not think of marrying another."

The following is from the will of Philip Thicknesse, Esq., of London, but subsequently of Boulogne, in France, deceased, proved January 24, 1793.

"I leave my right hand, to be cut off after my death, to my son, Lord Audley, and I desire it may be sent to him, in hopes that such a sight may remind him of his duty to God, after having so long abandoned the duty he owed to a father who once affectionately loved him."

PROSPECTUS OF THE CHARLESTON MERCURY

A Political, Commercial and Literary Journal, PUBLISHED DAILY AND TRI-WEEKLY. THE "Mercury" represents the State rights resistance element of the South. Its political creed consists in the principles of the Democratic Party as laid down in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 and 1799—the Sovereignty of the States and Strict Construction of the Federal Constitution by the General Government, the Agent of the States; Free Trade, and an Economical Administration of the General Government. Its policy is the union of the Southern States in maintaining their rights and establishing their equality.

The "Mercury" gives daily reports of Markets and Marine Intelligence of Charleston Commerce in the leading ports of the world. The Weekly Price Current is made up with much care, and from the most reliable sources. A connecting link with the "Associated Press" insures the latest intelligence by telegraph and the earliest news by steamers from Europe. It has an able and accomplished correspondent in London (a gentleman connected with the editorial staff of the London Times), and regular correspondents in New York, Washington, and the principal cities of the East and West. The monthly New York Fashion Letters are an additional attraction in favor of lady readers. It contains notices, from the pen of a gentleman who occupies perhaps the highest position among the literary men of the South, are discriminating and comprehensive. Attention is paid to all matters of general concern, especially those in reference to the South, the Planning and Agricultural interests, and to the current news of the day. Great care is taken that nothing shall appear in its columns which should be excluded from the family circle.

TERMS—PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.
Daily, per annum, \$10.00
Tri-weekly, " " " 5.00
Cutting will be published as follows:
Five copies of the Daily, \$10.00
Five copies of the Tri-weekly, \$5.00

The name of no person out of Charleston will be entered on our books unless the payment of the subscription be made in advance. Nor will orders from any other city to publish Advertisements, Marriage Notices or Obituaries, be attended to, unless the advertiser or publisher can be traced to the residence of the advertiser. Money may always be forwarded at our risk in registered letters.

Postmasters are authorized to act as Agents in obtaining subscribers and for forwarding the money and may retain twenty per cent. of the pre-payments for their trouble.

In the State, Mr. Samuel B. Burgess is our regular Agent to make collections and procure new business and subscriptions.
R. B. RHETT, Jr.,
No. 4 Broad Street, Charleston, S. C.

LESCOT & CO., New York, continue to publish the following British Periodicals, viz:
THE LONDON QUARTERLY, Conservative.
THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, Whig.
THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, Free Church.
THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, Liberal.

BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE, Tory. These Periodicals afford representation of the three great political parties of Great Britain—Whig, Tory and Radical; but politics forms only one feature of their character. As organs of the most profound writers on Science, Literature, Morality and Religion, they stand, as they have ever stood, unrivalled in the world of letters, being considered indispensable to the scholar and the professional man, while to the intelligent reader of every class they furnish a more correct and satisfactory record of the current literature of the day, throughout the world, than can be possibly obtained from any other source.

EARLY COPIES. The receipt of Advance Sheets from the British publishers gives additional value to these Reports, inasmuch as they can now be placed in the hands of our subscribers about as soon as the original editions.

TERMS—Per Annum:
For any one of the four Reviews, \$3.00
For any two of the four Reviews, 4.00
For any three of the four Reviews, 5.00
For all four of the Reviews, 6.00
For Blackwood's Magazine, 3.00
For Blackwood and one Review, 5.00
For Blackwood and two Reviews, 7.00
For Blackwood and three Reviews, 9.00
For Blackwood and the four Reviews, 10.00
Money current in the State where issued will be received at par.

CLUBBING. A discount of twenty-five per cent. from the above prices will be allowed to Clubs ordering direct from L. Scott & Co. four or more copies of any one or more of the above works. Thus, four copies of Blackwood, or of one Review, will be sent to one address for \$9; four copies of the four Reviews and Blackwood for \$30, and so on.

POSTAGE. In all the principal cities and can be delivered free of postage. Postage to any part of the country a year for Blackwood and three Reviews, 90 cents each of the Reviews, 25 cents each of the Blackwood.

LEONARD SCOTT & CO., No. 54 Gold Street, New York City.
NEW LAW FIRM.
KEITH & WILKES, ATTORNEYS AT LAW.
THE undersigned having formed a copartnership under the name and style of Keith and Wilkes, will attend promptly to all business entrusted to them for the Districts of Abbeville, Anderson, Pickens, Greenville, Spartanburg and Laurens. Mr. Keith will practice in the Equity Courts in those Districts. Their office is at No. 8, Brick Range, Anderson C. H., S. C.
E. M. KEITH.....WARREN D. WILKES.
Aug 14